P 40

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references

File No. 177-19

Serial Nos. 1-4

1919.

(Police)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for October 1919.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Chikkanagowda of Timmanahalli, Chickanayakanahalli Taluk, regarding grant of a license for conducting certain utsavams during Navarathri

G. R. S. III—1] 191 9

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Police.)

NOTES.

File No. 177-12

FILE HEADING.

Appeal of Chikkanna Gowda of Tummanahalli, Chikmagalur Tk, re grant of an escort for conducting certain Utsavams during Navarathri

From

No.	Dated	Received
Diary No.	Enclos. Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

NOTES—First Sheet.

Police 177 1137 (2

G.R.S. III

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

D. 1268 Appeal Petition from Chekka Rama Sowda and certain others of Ammavarakalli Village, Chickmagalur Taluq, in the matter of the grant of a license for the Conduct of certain Khandy during Navaratri of every year etc.

2) This appeal to come to be dealt with in the Jud. Br. of the Ch. Secty and may be passed to that Secty for disposal.

3) Bond no 1630 of 5.4.40 (Copy filed with the records was not issued from the Treas. Dept

Submitted 4)

6.2.41 A) may this be done?

4/2/41

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form.

GRSM.592

G.R.S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

1) There was a telegram received by this Office from the Petr some time in October which was sent to Dyfour for disposal. Put up reference.

KS. 6/2/19.

2) Mur. 2. no. 279 – 18 Sls 1–2 dealing with the telegram ref to is sirkus.

AV 11.2.19

3) This petn may be referred to the Chf Sectt. No Murai matter is involved in the case. vide Dyfour's order.

Secy.

4) With Compliments. KS. 13.2.19

14/2/19

(Chief Sectt.)

AV

file detached retained in the Secretariat

KW 14/2

5)

KS. 12/2/19

1377.

6) Yes

Rec'd

P. 14/2

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form.

GRSM.592

Police 1177/20

[—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

10) The Connected Vernacular Records have not yet been traced

11) They are being traced without which the case can not be worked up. Draft for order

12) Please expedite D.M. 5/3. B.T. 5/3 SGB

13) The Genl Records state that the papers are missing in the old Religious Branch Records.

SGB 25/3.

14) This is a petn against the order of the Asst magte, Kadur dist the petitioner has enclosed a copy of the same which has not been traced as referred to the missings in the General Records. Draft for order is in a diff calling for the Record. SGB 30.4. 30.4. 4) James for D.M. Circle

1 7 35 07 1

N.B.—*Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form.*

G.R.S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

To the D.C. Kadur by
No 6,285/50 dt 15.4.19

Called for the records connected with the case of the grant of a license to Chikkaramegowda and others for the conduct of certain ceremonies.

Lgt 19/4 (dl 4)

From the same
No HB. 567/18-19 dt 12/17 the June 1919

Forwards the connected records.

It is seen from the records received that the old mantap built by the Taikere Paleyar was made use of by the villagers of Nagarahalli & Timmanahalli hamlets on the Dasara occasions without any restriction.

Subsequently a new mantap was constructed by Chikkaramegowda of Timmanahalli for the exclusive right & use of the people of this village. From that time the Nagarahalli villagers were celebrating their Utsavams in the old Mantap. On this ground the prayer of the Timmanahalli villagers opposed to mamool has been refused by the Dy Commr Kadur Dist.

The appeal preferred by Chikkaramegowda & others

(dl 3)

flag W.

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

Police

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

A copy of the Govt. No. G.16597-608/Poc 116-17-2 dt 27.6.1919 is put up herewith.

303
17.7.19

16.7.19.

22/7/19

25-7-19

The

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

2557

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Subd.

1) The allegations contained in para 5 of the petition viz, that appellants were not informed of what had transpired in the actual proceedings is not true, as the record shows they were represented by their counsel & that his arguments in the matter were heard in toto. A

1)

[Papers containing order No: 1924-58 11-4-1902 and ending with endorsement No: 131986-8-1903 are here with put up for kind perusal of Vernacular Records when done with.]

4 flag-H.

22) This file may be sent to the Ver Records in view to verify whether the copy of this office end-t No 1630 of 5-4-1902 is genuine. This information is necessary as it has a bearing on the grounds of appeal.

SBB

23) 2518

To the Vernacular Records for kind perusal returning this file very early

NDA 26/8

Regd 33 30-8-19

Read on 3/9

3/9/1919 Subd

The construction of the new house on unoccupied and assessed at Rs 100 of Nivle village by Bhikvamegowda of Timmanahalli was permitted in End-t No. 1630 of 5th April 1902 and also upheld

N.B. -Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

A

G.R.S. 13]

2559
Police 177-10

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

B.1

in G.O. No. Pol 1924-5 dy 11.4.1902 on the appeal of the villagers of Nagarahalli.
A reconsideration of this order as prayed for by the villagers of Nagarahalli was rejected in Endt. No. 1319 dy 6th Dec 1902.
Therefore the statement contained in para 6 of the petition is not correct.

6.

SDB
12/9

B
The Version (4)

24) The terms of the Dy Com's order 9.10.18 in the case are as follows; —

(1) that the records disclose that the old mantapam was built long ago by Tarikere Palleyar for the use of his family God, Nagahalli Anjaneya Devaroo;

(2) that the villagers of Nagarahalli and Himmanahalli were in the habit of taking their deities during the Dasara to the said Mantap celebrating their festivities by fixing separate Plantain Trees & nova common one for both, and that there was no restriction that the villagers of any particular hamlet should first celebrate the festivities.

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

GPB—20,000 23-12-13

G.R.S. III—3]

Police 17-10 9

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

(3) That to avoid friction between the two villages Chikvame gowda of Thimmanahalli constructed a separate mantap on the same spot, at his own cost, 15 years ago for the use of his village deity, and that since then the old and the new mantaps were being used by the Nagahalli & Thimmanahalli villagers respectively for celebrating their festivities, by fixing separate plantain trees; and

(4) That therefore the claim of Thimmanahalli people to certain exclusive rights in the old mantap is opposed to manool & cannot be granted, and that the order of 12-1-1918 that they should not take their god to the old mantap & that, with a view to prevent breach of peace, they should execute a Muchalika & obtain a license before celebrating the festivities, cannot be reconsidered.

27) The grounds urged by Chikkvame gowda and others in their appeal petition are noted below:—

(1) That the old mantap was constructed by their ancestors for conducting the Utsavam during Dasara, of the Rameswaradevaru by Thimmanahalli people, and that for the use of the deities of other villages two side Kattes or platforms were also built near the said mantap

(2)

Sl. no. 1 A
in the verna
file

PWD I

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Police 177-20 19

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

(2) That when Chikkrame Gowda undertook to construct at his own cost another mantap Nagarahalli people protested on the ground that the old mantap was constructed by their ancestors in their Inam land, but that this contention was overruled, as it was held that the land was Sirkar land & not Inam.

(3) That since the new building came into existence, Rameswaradevaroo is being seated in the old & Malledevaroo in the new mantams & that the festivities are being conducted by fixing only one Pantam tree.

(4) That the finding that the old mantap was constructed by Tamilian Pallegars & that the old & new mantaps are being used by Nagarahalli & Thimmanahalli people respy by fixing separate Pantam trees for their festivities celebrations is not correct; and,

(5) That the Dy authorities have created a right — hitherto non-existent — in favour of Nagarahalli people, and that the order of the Dy Com requiring the villagers of Thimmanahalli to take out a licence is for conducting their festival is unjust & is prejudicial to their interests.

27) The Dy Com's finding that the old mantap was constructed by Tamilian Pallegars is based on the Tk Amildar's report of 2-12-17 which is again based on the statements of Nagarahalli & Harle villagers. This is however opposed to the view held by the Asst Com in his order of 13th March 1901 that the representation of Nagarahalli people to the ownership of the mantap could not be supported. There is at the same time nothing to prove that the mantap was constructed by the ancestors of Thimmanahalli villagers

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

as contended in the appeal petition.

2) As regards the use of the two mantaps and the fixing of plantain trees, there is nothing to controvert the DC's finding that the old mantap is being used by the Nagarahalli villagers & the new one by the Thimmanahalli villagers by fixing separate plantain trees for their celebrations. The appellants however refer to a representation made by Nagarahalli people in 1900, in connection with the new mantap then under construction, that only one plantain tree should be used for the celebration, the use of two being considered ominous. Whatever may have been the practice prior to the construction of the new mantap, there is nothing, except the statement of Thimmanahalli people, to show that only one plantain tree is being fixed for all the celebrations even after the new mantap came into being.

3) Re the execution of Muchalika & the taking out of licence for conducting the celebrations, it is submitted that while the Taluk Amildar suggested that, to prevent breach of the peace, the people of both the hamlets may be required to execute the muchalika &c, the DC has ordered the same only in respect of the Thimmanahalli people, perhaps on the ground that they were responsible for the recent differences.

U.

B.

Subd with reference to the order in para 20 supra.

ASR
27/9

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Police. 177 of 12

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

In this case the Amildar held an enquiry on the subject matter of the dispute between the parties & made a report. The H.C. accepted the finding of the Amildar and held that the old mantap was built by the Tamilian Pallavas for the use of Rajaraja Anjaneya Devaru, that Chikkarayanagowda of Thimmarajally constructed a new mantap for his village about 15 years ago, and that since then the old mantap was being used by the Rajarajally people & the new mantap by the Thimmarajally people. The H.C.

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

13

12)

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent recor

also the ord. that
the Thummanhally people to keep the peace
should execute a muchalika
& also take out a license
under the provs of the D.C.
O. 12.6.1918 — A).

The appellants presented an
appn on 9.8.1918 to the D.C.
through their Advocate, praying
for a re-consideration of the
above order. The D.C. heard
the pleaders on both sides and
held that there was no
reason to re-consider the order
& rejected the petition on 9.10.18 (H.B.)

Hence against this order that
the appellants have preferred
their appeal to Govt. The

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

14

Inter. 77—10

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

grounds urged by the Advocate are untenable and are not supported by the record. The allegations made in the appeal petition are opposed to fair presentation of facts and may not be taken into consideration at this stage. The G.O. of 11.4.1902 (Ch. B.) clearly shows that the new municipal building to accommodate the duty of Thiruvanchall and it is opined to decide whether the appellants could be allowed to go behind an express statement made in the var

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

15

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

C.C. and urge claim
allyd claims to the old
market.
The significant fact
the Appellants declined to
exercise a memorialists as
evidenced by the C.C. claim
reply is annexed to the report
of the Amilda case & 16.5.18 (Z)
on this point which also
shows that the appellants
agreed to Amadeo declar
&c in support of their exclusive
rights in 15 days. Appellants
the Carlos. They failed to produce
Claim either before the Amilda
or before the D.C. when they
presented as ref^d through Min Madrid on 9.8.1918

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

15

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

C.A. and urge claim
allyd claims to the old
mantap.
No significant trade
the Appellants declined to
execute as instructed as
evidenced by the W.C. letter
refd to is annexed to the report
of the Amildar dated 16.5.18 (2)
on this point which also
shows that the appellants
agreed to produce deeds
&c in support of their exclusive
rights in 15 days. Appellants
the latter they failed to produce
them either before the Amildar
or before the W.C. who they
dismissed as per Judgt through Hiri Mudem on 9.8.1918

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Three 17—16

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Again, in the face of the express order of the C. to take out a licence to conduct their procession, it is not clear why the appellants are so very unwilling to take out a licence. Even in their telegram of 26.9.19 addressed to the Dewan, the appellants have stated that their procession should be permitted without a licence.

Besides, the rights claimed by the appellants seem to be of a civil nature, and questions relating to the procedure and

xcluded file

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

17 2557 15

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

any
arrangements
which may
may perhaps be
be decided by the civil
civil

Sent for orders
P.M.
29/9

C.O. 39
30.9.19.

II Member

38 I think this should
dealt with by the member in charge
the first portfolio & not
submitted to 2nd member

30/9

Sent for orders
P.M.
2/10

1655
3-10-19

II Member

39. Whether, upon the release
men in attached Wireless Mess up,
they can remain where given it up when
the unit / Mess up was built for. The use
their duty. The / Wireless / Mess should
permission was granted in G.O.C. for the same purpose.
The unit Mess up in the first land in the understanding

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this sheet.

[I.R.S. III—3]

Police 177—1918

Routine Notes.

To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

255

5747

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

28 OCT 1919

11 NOV 1919

N.B Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

COURT FEE — MYSORE — TWO RUPEES

AN 1919

20

56393

[illegible]

[illegible]

ತಾ॥ 21-1-1919 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

1268

ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿಗಳು.

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

2 [illegible]

3 [illegible]

4 [illegible]

ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

2 [illegible]

3 [illegible]

4 [illegible]

[illegible] 9-10-1918 [illegible]

I. [illegible]

[illegible]

4 [illegible] 1630-673 / 6-4-901 [illegible] 12-1-18 [illegible]

5. [illegible]

6.) ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ. ಸದರಿ

The Vernacular
Records Connected
with these fortresses have
not yet been traced.
Every attempt is
being made to trace
them. without them
no action could be
taken

E&S

P.S. may be
of interest

Ch: Lieut.

C&R
6.3.19 Early Mercs
Pers
873

24 Regd post 1.3.19.

25.

12583.

Chikkarame Gowda & Ramel Gowda of Thimmanahalli -

To Prays for an acknowledgment of a petition submitted by them on 21.1.19 in connection with a dispute about a stone mantap built by them for Shiballeswara Rameswara & the procession of the God.

Date of ... 6.3.19

53.

Petition Panel

It is not entered in the Petition Register. As it was found in the pet.n box, the chief Secy referred it to the Mun. Secy from whom it was transferred to the Police Section. Its present stage is noted in the slip below.

60143

Ans 5/3

14 Recd for 14.7.19 Chick Rama Gowda & others of Murale Thimmanahalli; — Request early orders on their appeal petition dt 24.1.19 about the procession during Dasara.

(One anna stamp affixed)



2557

Ch. Sub. 1.8.19

Ch. for Kannada early orders 31.7.19

Prob. 3396

[illegible] 24.1.1919 [illegible]

1900 [illegible] 1917 · 1918 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 6-2-1919 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 23-7-1919

[illegible]

[illegible]

27

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to....11379....

Section Police
File No. 177-20
Serial No. 2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,
( )
, *the* 191 .

No. G2355

Date of issue.....15-9-09.....

To

The Dist Magte, Kadur Dist

Sir

I am directed to request that the records connected with the case regarding the grant of a license for the Conduct of Chikka Ramegowda and Certain others of Thimmanahalli village, Chickmagalur taluk for the Conduct of Certain Utsavams during Navaratri of every year etc may be submitted at an early date

I have etc

D. W. Clerk
for Secy

Signed by.....

B.7 10M

A.V.
30.4.19

Army Seeds

68173



28

1949



DIARY No 2098 & 1469

19/8/19 19

SECTION Main

FILE No

SERIAL No

7558

CHIEF SECRETARY

PROTECTORATE

5th SEP 1919

COURT FEE

TWO RUPEES

31

574

RETARIAT

VII

MUZRAI

22 MAY 1919

ಸಂಪಾದಕರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಮಾನವನ ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಪ್ರಜ್ಞೆಯ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದ ಪಾತ್ರ ಮಹತ್ವದ್ದು. ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಸಮಾಜದ ಕನ್ನಡಿಯಾಗಿ ಸಮಾಜದ ಒಳಿತು ಕೆಡುಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಬಿಂಬಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಮಾಜದ ಅಂಕುಡೊಂಕುಗಳನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದಿ ತೀಡಿ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಮಾಜದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೂ

Office of the Deputy Commissioner.
Kadur District.
Dated, Camp Mysore, 13th June 1919.

From.

K. Mylar Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Off. Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District.

To.

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to Government.
Bangalore.

Sir,

As called for in your letter No. G. 23550, dated the 15th April 1919, I have the honor to submit herewith two files of Correspondence received with the Chikmagalur Sub Division Assistant Commissioner's yadi no 365 of 1918-19, dated 15th May 1919, relating to the grant of a license to Chikka Rameyowda and Others of Thimmanahalli village, Chikmagalur Taluk, for the Conduct of certain "Utsavams" during "Navaratri" of every year.

2. The facts of the case are given in the order passed by Mr. C. Devaraj Urs on the 9th October 1918. (Flag B).

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

K. Mylar Rao
Off. Deputy Commissioner,
Kadur District.

W.D. 0244—GPB—6.00,000—19-5-16—S.

191 8-9

From 73042

The Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Govt of H. H. the Maharaja
of Mysore.

Dated 12th June 1919

Despatched 17 —do—

Received

General No. MC. 567

No. 48-9

Enclosure No. 12 Records

Submitting records connected with the case of granting a license to Chikkaregowda and certain other of Thimmanahally village for the conduct of certain Utsavams during Dasara.

P.C. 19-6



Inc Rs Stamps

(5)

34

In the Court of the Devan to the Hon'ble the Maharaja of Mysore

Pet^n No. of 19/20.

The humble Petition of Chick Ramegowda & others of the village of Hariharakalli Amble Hobli, Chickanayakan Taluq & an follows:—

1. That an appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner Kedesa district restraining the Petrs from celebrating the Mahanavami Utsava in the ancient Mantap situated in S.No. 200 of Hariharakalli filed on 24.1.1919 is still pending disposal.
2. That there are two Mantaps close to each other, one ancient & built by the ancestors of Chick Ramegowda & another new one built by Chick Ramegowda himself.
3. That it has been an ancient Custom for the deities of the neighbouring villages to be brought in procession to the ancient Mantap on the Vijayadashami day.
4. That the Deputy Commr by his order under appeal, has restrained the Petrs from celebrating the Utsavam in the ancient Mantap in violation of the long standing rights of the Petrs and is requiring them to be taken for the use of the new Mantap

both of which acts are irregular and contrary to Custom.

5. That there is no reason whatever for the people of Nagamalai to be permitted to celebrate their Utsavam in the Ancient Mantap which the same is denied to Pets.

6. That Pets beg to represent that the Dasara is approaching and as the appeal is not yet disposed of, they pray they may be permitted to celebrate the Utsavam under Police vigilance if necessary this year pending disposal of the appeal as regards their respective rights, in due Course.

7. That Pets are earnest in their prayer as there is a belief that the omission has been the cause of the epidemics & other fatalities in the village ever since the cessation of the celebration.

[illegible]



ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

19[illegible]19 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ [illegible] ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜೀದಾರ್.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್.

ಮಾ ರಾ ll [illegible] ಪರವಿಗೆ.

ಪಾದಿಗಳು ಧರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಜ್ಜೈರುವರೆಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷವಾದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಪೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಪೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಪೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈಜು ಪಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯುಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮುಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಧಿಟ್ಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 16/9/19 ರೂಜು [illegible]

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ವರಿಜ್ಞಿಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಹಿ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈ ಫಾರ್ಮಗಳು

ಬಿ. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿ, ಬುಕ್ಕು ಸೆಲರ್, ದೊಡ್ಡಪೇಟೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ.

ಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತೆ

Sri Venkatesa Press, Bangalore City 1919.

POSTS TELEGRAPHS.

NOTICE.

This form must accompany any inquiry made respecting this Telegram.

Charges to pay.	
Rs.	As.

Office Stamp.

Handed in at (Office of Origin)	Date.	Hour.	Minute.	Service Instructions.	Words.
Chikmagalur	26	14	30		50

TO

Recd. here at 15/42 H. M.

R/ adly. Dewansaheb mysore.

Chikkramegowda and others of Kasaba Thimmahally in Chikmagalur Taluk petitioners you on 19/9/19 against deputy Commissioners order prohibiting procession of their god to village mentapa on Maharavami day on thirty yet pray direct deputy Commr

N.B.—The name of the Sender, if telegraphed, is written after the text.

Lal Chand & Sons—2363—23-7-18—90,000 Bks. (Mint) D.

POSTS TELEGRAPHS.

27

NOTICE. This form must accompany any inquiry made respecting this Telegram.	Charges to pay. Rs.	As.	Accounting.

Handed in at (Office of Origin).	Date.	Hour.	Minute.	Service Instructions.	Words.
TO (a)				Rcvd. here at H.	M.

to permit procession without license
matter extremely urgent awaiting reply'

N.B —The name of the Sender, if telegraphed, is written after the text.

Lal Chand & Sons—2303—23-7-18—90,000 Bks. (Indo-Engl).

A P

POSTS TELEGRAPHS

No

Prefix Code INLAND REPLY TELEGRAM FOR

Office of Origin, Date and Service Instructions. Sent at M

Excess Charge Rs. A. P.

Space for Postage Stamps

in payment of excess charge (if any) must be affixed by the Sender, and must not overlap. Any Stamp for which there is not room here should be affixed at the back of this Form.

Stamps cut, torn or defaced are not accepted.

Rates for Inland telegrams.

	First twelve words. Rs.	A.	P.	Each additional word. Rs.	A.	P.
Ordinary	0	6	0	0	0	6
Express	1	0	0	0	2	0

If the class of the reply telegram is to be EXPRESS it should be entered here.

NOTICE.

The address of this Telegram must be as full as that of an ordinary Telegram.

TO Name / Address / Place

FROM

NOT TO BE TELEGRAPHED. *Signature and Address of Sender*

INLAND REPLY VOUCHER

A sum of *Rs [illegible] having been deposited for a reply to a Telegram No. [illegible] handed in at [illegible] at [illegible] M. this Form will be accepted within two months of the date of issue at any Telegraph Office in payment or in part payment, as the case may be, of an Inland Telegram.



Signature of Issuing Clerk

* NOTE.—The sum paid must be written in words, not in figures.

N.B.—If this form be not used, the amount deposited will be returned to the sender of the original Telegram on application being made by the Sender to the Deputy Accountant-General, Telegraph Check Office Calcutta within two months of the date of issue. After this interval no application for the return of the amount will be entertained. This form must be produced when the application is made. If the charge for the telegram franked by this form is less than the amount deposited, the difference, if it be not less than eight annas, will be refunded to the Sender as stated above. A refund cannot be made on a Reply telegram form which has been prepaid by another Reply telegram form and not by cash or stamps.

ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR STAMPS.

The *ACCURACY* of telegrams is not guaranteed: the Sender must accept ***ALL RISKS*** arising from non-delivery, errors or delays. *Complaints* respecting this telegram should be addressed to the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs, Traffic Branch, Calcutta, within two months of the date of the telegram. The receipt granted for the telegram should be enclosed with the reference. For detailed rules, see the ***Telegraph Guide*** (price 4 annas).

Lal Chand & Sons, Calcutta—No. 328 P. O.—3-11 15—6,000 Bks.

58

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to... 7357 / 5167

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT
(.)
the 191 .

Date of issue... 13.10.1919

Signed by...

Section Police.
File No. 177-20
Serial No. 6

Endt No. 4[illegible]/1919.

To

1. Chikkaranegowda and others of Timmanahalli, Ambligolla, Chikmagalur Taluk.

With reference to their petition dt 21-1-1919 appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr, Kadur, ~~refusing the grant of a license for conducting certain utsavams~~ directing a license for conducting the utsavam every year, Chikkaranegowda is informed that it is seen from the records that the old mantap built by the Tarikere Palegars has now been in use of the villagers of Timmanahalli & that the new mantap built by him in use by his village people, that permission to construct the new mantap was granted on the distinct understanding that the people of Timmanahalli would forego the use of the old one, and that therefore his petition is rejected.

2. If he has any right at all for the use of the old mantap, he may establish it in a Civil Court.

3. The enclosures received with this petition are returned herewith.

By order

for Chief Secy

over.

directing prescribing the taking out of a license for conducting the utsavam of their village deity during Dasara and restricting their activities to the new mantap constructed in recent years, Chikkaramegowda and others of Timmanahalli are informed that ~~as the object of constructing~~ the new mantap ~~was for~~ in 1902 accommodating their village God and the records of the case show that ~~the people of Timmanahalli~~ since have been making use of the said mantap for their utsavams, the Collr was asked ~~to~~ prepared to revise the said order, passed by the Dy Comr in the matter & that their appeal their petition is accordingly rejected. It appears also informed that the right which they claim with respect to allege for the use of the old mantap is of a civil nature & it is open to them

the order of the D.C. is correct and that Govt find no reason to

P.T.O.

Memo No. [illegible]

39

Copy forwarded to Dwk. Channegowda & others of Nagamballi, with reference to their petitions of 28.4.19 & 21.5.1919 respectively.

B. O.

For Chief Secy.

SBB
10/10

Memo No. [illegible]

Copy of the above is forwarded with enquiries to the D.C. Kadur with refee to correspondence ending with his letter No. H.B. 567/18-19 d/ 12th June 1919, and returning the two files of records received therewith.

B. O.

List of enclosures.

For Chief Secy

SBB
10/10

11/10

Copied by

Examined by

WD. 1744—GPB—80,000—19-8-19.

40

GPB—10,000—12-7-15

G. R. S. 34]

No. G.8897./Misc.

GOVERNMENT OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

( )

Office Memorandum.

To

the 20. 10. 191

Endorsement.

Chikramegowda and others of Timmanahalli, Amble Hobli, Chickmagalur Taluk.

***

With reference to their petition dated 21st January 1919 appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur directing the taking out of a license for conducting the utsavam of their village deity during the Dasara and restricting their activities to the new mantap constructed in recent years, Chickramegowda and others of Timmanahalli are informed that the order of the Deputy Commissioner is correct and that Government find no reason to revise the said order and their petition is accordingly rejected. The right which they claim with respect to the use of the old mantap is of a civil nature and it is open to them to establish it in a Civil court.

2. The enclosures received with ~~his~~ their petition are returned herewith.

By Order,

for Chief Secretary to Government.